UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

REGINALD JOHNSON,	:	CIVIL NO: 4:13-CV-01244
	:	
Plaintiff	:	
	:	(Judge Brann)
v.	:	
	:	(Magistrate Judge Schwab)
CATHERINE C. MCVEY and	:	
PENNSYLVANIA BOARD OF	:	
PROBATION AND PAROLE,	:	
	:	
Defendants	:	

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

I. Introduction.

This case comes before the court for a statutorily mandated screening review. The prisoner plaintiff complains about the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole filing an untimely brief in a state court action and about the Pennsylvania Supreme Court issuing a per curiam opinion. After reviewing the complaint in accordance with the mandated screening provision in 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, we conclude that it fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted and that granting Johnson leave to amend would be futile. Accordingly, we recommend that the complaint be dismissed and that the case be closed.

II. Factual Background and Procedural History.

The plaintiff, Reginald Johnson, brings this case against the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole (Board) and the Board's Chairperson, Catherine McVey. Johnson's allegations are sparse and not entirely clear. He alleges that the Board filed an untimely brief in a state court action, and he alleges that the Pennsylvania Supreme Court issued a per curiam opinion. He questions how the Pennsylvania Supreme Court could have issued a per curiam opinion given that Justice Orie Melvin faced a May 7, 2013, sentencing. Johnson is seeking seven million dollars.[1]

III. Discussion.

A. Screening of *Pro Se* Complaints—Standard of Review.

This Court has a statutory obligation to conduct a preliminary review of *pro se* complaints brought by plaintiffs given leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in cases that seek redress against government officials. Specifically, we are obliged

1 We note that this case is the not the only case that Johnson has filed that raises similar claims. In *Johnson v. Pennsylvania*, 4:12-CV-02588 (M.D.Pa.), Johnson complained about the failure of the Lycoming County District Attorney's Office to file a timely brief in one of his state court actions. Adopting a Report and Recommendation of the undersigned, on May 23, 2013, Judge Brann dismissed that action with prejudice.

to review the complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A which provides, in pertinent part:

> **(a) Screening.—**The court shall review, before docketing, if feasible or, in any event, as soon as practicable after docketing, a complaint in a civil action in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity.
> **(b) Grounds for dismissal.—**On review, the court shall identify cognizable claims or dismiss the complaint, or any portion of the complaint, if the complaint—
> **(1)** is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted; or
> **(2)** seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief.

Under Section 1915A, the court must assess whether a *pro se* complaint "fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted." This statutory text mirrors the language of Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which provides that a complaint should be dismissed for "failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted." Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(b)(6).

With respect to this benchmark standard for legal sufficiency of a complaint, the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit has aptly noted the evolving standards governing pleading practice in federal court, stating that:

> Standards of pleading have been in the forefront of jurisprudence in recent years. Beginning with the Supreme Court's opinion in *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 127 S.Ct. 1955, 167 L.Ed.2d 929 (2007),

> continuing with our opinion in *Phillips [v. County of Allegheny*, 515 F.3d 224, 230 (3d Cir.2008)], and culminating recently with the Supreme Court's decision in *Ashcroft v. Iqbal* 556 U.S. 662, 129 S.Ct. 1937, 173 L.Ed.2d 868 (2009), pleading standards have seemingly shifted from simple notice pleading to a more heightened form of pleading, requiring a plaintiff to plead more than the possibility of relief to survive a motion to dismiss.

Fowler v. UPMC Shadyside, 578 F.3d 203, 209–10 (3d Cir. 2009).

"Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2), a pleading must contain a 'short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.'" *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 677-78 (2009). The statement required by Rule 8(a)(2) must give the defendant fair notice of what the plaintiff's claim is and of the grounds upon which it rests. *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 93 (2007). Detailed factual allegations are not required, but more is required than labels, conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action. *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007). "In other words, a complaint must do more than allege the plaintiff's entitlement to relief." *Fowler, supra,* 578 F.3d at 211. "A complaint has to 'show' such an entitlement with its facts." *Id.*

In considering whether a complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, the court must accept as true all well-pleaded factual allegations in the complaint, and all reasonable inferences that can be drawn from the complaint are to be construed in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. *Jordan v. Fox Rothschild, O'Brien*

& Frankel, Inc., 20 F.3d 1250, 1261 (3d Cir. 1994). A court, however, "need not credit a complaint's bald assertions or legal conclusions when deciding a motion to dismiss." *Morse v. Lower Merion Sch. Dist.*, 132 F.3d 902, 906 (3d Cir. 1997). Additionally, a court need not "assume that a . . . plaintiff can prove facts that the . . . plaintiff has not alleged." *Associated Gen. Contractors of Cal. v. California State Council of Carpenters*, 459 U.S. 519, 526 (1983).

In conducting a review of the adequacy of a complaint, the Supreme Court has advised trial courts that they must:

> [B]egin by identifying pleadings that because they are no more than conclusions are not entitled to the assumption of truth. While legal conclusions can provide the framework of a complaint, they must be supported by factual allegations. When there are well-pleaded factual allegations, a court should assume their veracity and then determine whether they plausibly give rise to an entitlement to relief.

Iqbal, supra, 556 U.S. at 679.

Thus, following *Twombly* and *Iqbal*, a well-pleaded complaint must contain more than mere legal labels and conclusions. Rather, it must recite factual allegations sufficient to raise the plaintiff's claimed right to relief beyond the level of mere speculation. In practice, consideration of the legal sufficiency of a complaint entails a three-step analysis:

> First, the court must 'tak[e] note of the elements a plaintiff must plead to state a claim.' Second, the court should identify allegations that, 'because they are no more than conclusions, are not entitled to the assumption of truth.' Finally, 'where there are well-pleaded factual allegations, a court

> should assume their veracity and then determine whether they plausibly give rise to an entitlement for relief.'

Santiago v. Warminster Twp., 629 F.3d 121, 130 (3d Cir. 2010)(quoting *Iqbal, supra*, 556 U.S. at 675 & 679).

A complaint filed by a *pro se* litigant is to be liberally construed and '"however inartfully pleaded, must be held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers.'" *Erickson, supra,* 551 U.S. at 94 (quoting *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976)). Nevertheless, "pro se litigants still must allege sufficient facts in their complaints to support a claim." *Mala v. Crown Bay Marina, Inc.*, 704 F.3d 239, 245 (3d Cir. 2013). Thus, a well-pleaded complaint must contain more than mere legal labels and conclusions. Rather, a *pro se* complaint must recite factual allegations that are sufficient to raise the plaintiff's claimed right to relief beyond the level of mere speculation, set forth in a "short and plain" statement of a cause of action.

B. Any Claim Against the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole is Barred by the Eleventh Amendment.

Although Johnson brings this action against the Board, any claim against the Board is barred by the Eleventh Amendment, which provides:

> The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State.

U.S. Const. Amend. XI.

Although its text appears to restrict only the Article III diversity jurisdiction of the federal courts, the Eleventh Amendment has been interpreted "to stand not so much for what it says, but for the presupposition . . . which it confirms." *Seminole Tribe of Fla. v. Florida*, 517 U.S. 44, 54 (1996)(quoting *Blatchford v. Native Village of Noatak*, 501 U.S. 775, 779 (1991)). That presupposition is that each state is a sovereign entity in our federal system and that it is inherent in the nature of sovereignty that a sovereign is not amenable to suit unless it consents. *Id.* Thus, "the Constitution does not provide for federal jurisdiction over suits against nonconsenting States." *Kimel v. Florida Bd. of Regents*, 528 U.S. 62, 73 (2000).

In the absence of consent, a suit in federal court against the state or one of its agencies is barred by the Eleventh Amendment. *Alabama v. Pugh*, 438 U.S. 781, 782 (1978)(per curiam). A state, however, may waive its Eleventh Amendment immunity by consenting to suit, and Congress may abrogate States' Eleventh Amendment immunity when it unequivocally intends to do so and it acts pursuant to a valid grant of constitutional authority. *College Savings Bank v. Florida Prepaid Postsecondary Educ. Expense Bd.*, 527 U.S. 666, 670 (1999).

The Board is an agency of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. *See* 61 Pa.C.S.A. § 6111. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has not waived its Eleventh Amendment immunity, *see* 42 P.C.S.A. § 8521(b), and 42 U.S.C. § 1983 does not

override a state's Eleventh Amendment immunity. *Quern v. Jordan*, 440 U.S. 332 (1979). Accordingly, any claim against the Board is barred by the Eleventh Amendment.

C. The Complaint Fails to State a Claim Upon Which Relief May Be Granted Against Defendant McVey.

Johnson names McVey as a defendant, but he does not allege any facts about her involvement in any violation of his rights.

Liability under Section 1983 "'cannot be predicated solely on the operation of respondeat superior.'" *Evancho v. Fisher*, 423 F.3d 347, 353 (3d Cir. 2005) (quoting *Rode v. Dellarciprete*, 845 F.2d 1195, 1207 (3d Cir. 1998)). Thus, a constitutional deprivation cannot be premised merely on the fact that the defendant was a supervisor when the incidents set forth in the complaint occurred. *See Alexander v. Forr*, 297 F. App'x 102, 104-05 (3d Cir. 2008). "Because vicarious liability is inapplicable to *Bivens* and § 1983 suits, a plaintiff must plead that each Government-official defendant, through the official's own individual actions, has violated the Constitution." *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 676 (2009).

There are two viable theories of supervisory liability. *Santiago v. Warminster Twp.*, 129 F.3d, 121, 129 n.5 (3d Cir. 2010). Under the first theory, a supervisor can be liable if he or she established and maintained a policy, practice, or custom that

directly caused the constitutional harm. *Id.* Under the second theory, a supervisor can be liable if he or she participated in violating the plaintiff's rights, directed others to violate the plaintiff's rights, or as the person in charge had knowledge of and acquiesced in his or her subordinates' violations of the plaintiff's rights. *Id.*

Johnson has not alleged that McVey was personally involved in violating his rights. Moreover, Johnson has simply not alleged how the failure of the Board to file a timely brief violated his constitutional rights. Because Johnson has not alleged any facts from which it can reasonably be inferred that defendant McVey violated his rights, the complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted against McVey.

D. The Complaint Should Be Dismissed With Prejudice.

Before dismissing a complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted under the screening provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court must grant the plaintiff leave to amend his complaint unless amendment would be inequitable or futile. *See Grayson v. Mayview State Hospital*, 293 F.3d 103, 114 (3d Cir. 2002). In this case, amendment would be futile because the Board has Eleventh Amendment immunity and because there is no basis to conclude that either the late filing of the Board's brief in the state court action or the denomination of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court's opinion as per curiam violated Johnson's constitutional rights.

Thus, we will recommend that the court dismiss the complaint without granting Johnson leave to amend.

IV. Recommendations.

Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons, **IT IS RECOMMENDED** that Johnson's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* be granted. **IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED** that the complaint be dismissed

The Parties are further placed on notice that pursuant to Local Rule 72.3:

> Any party may object to a magistrate judge's proposed findings, recommendations or report addressing a motion or matter described in 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(B) or making a recommendation for the disposition of a prisoner case or a habeas corpus petition within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy thereof. Such party shall file with the clerk of court, and serve on the magistrate judge and all parties, written objections which shall specifically identify the portions of the proposed findings, recommendations or report to which objection is made and the basis for such objections. The briefing requirements set forth in Local Rule 72.2 shall apply. A judge shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge. The judge, however, need conduct a new hearing only in his or her discretion or where required by law, and may consider the record developed before the magistrate judge, making his or her own determination on the basis of that record. The judge may also receive

further evidence, recall witnesses or recommit the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.

Submitted this 29th day of May, 2013.

S/*Susan E. Schwab*
Susan E. Schwab
United States Magistrate Judge